

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 16-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5-8 have been amended. Claims 10-15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 16-18 have been newly added. No new matter has been added with the addition of claims 16-18.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby overcoming the rejection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

35 USC §102

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Beardsley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,980). Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection for the following reasons.

In the present invention, a computer system has a primary computer and a secondary computer. A data receiver of the secondary computer sends a read request to read a part of a plurality of data records stored in a memory provided with the primary computer to a data transmitter of the primary computer, based on an indication of a program executed by a processor of the secondary computer. Upon receipt of the read request, the data transmitter of the primary computer sends the part of the data records designated by information contained in the read request to the data receiver of the secondary computer.

According to the present invention, the data receiver of the secondary computer that received the part of the data records stores the received data records into a memory provided with the secondary computer.

In contrast, in Beardsley et al, the asynchronous data system 200 is disclosed as collecting data from the primary storage controllers 205 so that an order of all data writes to the primary DASDs 206 is preserved and applied to the secondary DASDs 216. Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Beardsley et al. of the claimed aspect of the invention in which a data receiver of the secondary computer makes a read request to read a set of data records stored in a memory of

the primary computer based on an indication from a processor of the secondary computer and sends the read request to a data transmitter of the primary computer.

The description in Beardsley et al. cited for support of the rejection only explains that the system as a whole obtains control data from the primary computer in order to make orders for all data writes identical in both the primary computer and the secondary computer using flags. This feature is not related to the claimed combination of the present invention, which includes that the data receiver of the secondary computer sends to a data transmitter of the primary computer a request to read a part of a plurality of data records stored in a memory provided with the primary computer, based on an indication of a program executed by a processor of the secondary computer, as claimed in claim 10. Accordingly, claim 1-8 are patentable over Beardsley et al.

In new claim 16, the second processor is claimed to indicate a receiver coupled to a second processor of a second computer to send a read request to the transmitter coupled to the first processor via a network. The read request includes information generated by the second processor that indicates a part of the plurality of data records stored in the first memory. The information is generated by the second processor by using address information of the first memory. The receiver sends the read request to the transmitter via the network and the transmitter reads the part of the plurality of data records from the first memory and sends the part of the plurality of data records to the receiver via the network in response to the read request. Accordingly, claim 16 is patentable over the art of record, and in particular over the Beardsley et al. reference.


Claims 17 and 18 are dependent on claim 16 and set forth additional limitations not shown or suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, each of these claims is patentable at least for depending from an allowable base claim and further for being directed to separately patentable subject matter of the invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 
John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120

Date: August 31, 2005